

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/658,655 | 09/09/2003 | David Hauch | 17238.79 | 1994 |
| 32300 | 7590 11/16/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| BRIGGS AND MORGAN, P.A. 2200 IDS CENTER | | | O MALLEY, KATHRYN S | |
| MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3749 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | . ^ | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| | 10/658,655 | HAUCH, DAVID | Mo i | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Kathryn S. O'Malley | 3749 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply | appears on the cover sheet with | the correspondence add | iress | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state that the period for reply will, by state that the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repl eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (; od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAN | ly be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. IS from the mailing date of this co NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | mmunication. | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 |) July 2004. | | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ T | his action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allow | ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice unde | r Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. | 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application | ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5)⊠ Claim(s) 9 is/are allowed. | | ı | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,7,8 and 10-14</u> is/are rejected. | • | | | | | |
| 7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-6</u> is/are objected to. | 7. • 4.4 • | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and | d/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam | iner. | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 January 2004 is/a | are: a) $oxtime$ accepted or b) $oxtime$ obj | ected to by the Examine | er. | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | he drawing(s) be held in abeyance | e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the ∞rr | ection is required if the drawing(s |) is objected to. See 37 CF | R 1.121(d). | | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the | Examiner. Note the attached (| Office Action or form PT | O-152. | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | ign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1 | 19(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | • | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority docume | ents have been received. | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority docume | ents have been received in Ap | plication No | | | | |
| Copies of the certified copies of the p | riority documents have been re | eceived in this National | Stage | | | |
| application from the International Bur | eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a l | ist of the certified copies not re | eceived. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | | mmary (PTO-413) | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ | F-7-9 | Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTC |)-152) | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/7/04</u> . | 6) Other: | | • | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/658,655 Page 2

Art Unit: 3749

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. Claims 10-14 recite limitations such as "the slurry," "the inlet pipe," "the dryer section," "the rotor," "the reservoir". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,265,347 to Woodson et al. in view of US Patent 6,159,360 to Gerteis et al.
- 6. Woodson et al. teaches a centrifugal pellet dryer comprising a reservoir section in the vicinity of walls 56 and 20; a dryer section housing rotor 16 with conduit 92 for the introduction of drying air; and a motor section 70. Note column 2, lines 52-66; column 4, lines 11-15; and Figures 1, 3, and 6. Woodson et al. does not teach forcing

Application/Control Number: 10/658,655 Page 3

Art Unit: 3749

preheated drying air into the dryer. Gerteis teaches a similar centrifugal dryer comprising centrifuge 7 and drying air inlet pipe 41 for supplying preheated drying air to the centrifuge. Note column 5, lines 3-10 and Figure 1. As Gerteis et al. teaches that supplying preheated drying air to a centrifugal dryer will lead to more efficient drying, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the dryer of Woodson et al. with the forced, preheated drying air of Gerteis et al.

- 7. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodson et al. in view of Gerteis et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent 5,987,769 to Ackerman et al.
- 8. Woodson et al., as modified by Gerteis et al., does not teach a canister, screen, pan, or hinge as presently claimed. Ackerman et al. teaches a similar centrifugal dryer comprising dryer section 14 hinged to reservoir section 12, canister 66, bottom pan 46, and screen 68. Note column 2, line 60- column 3, line 18; column 4, lines 13-24; and Figures 1 and 2. As Ackerman et al. teaches that the hinge, pan, screen, and canister lead to more efficient processing, and specifically easier cleaning, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the dryer of Woodson et al. as modified by Gerteis et al., with the canister, screen, pan, and hinge of Ackerman et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claim 9 is allowed.

Art Unit: 3749

10. Claims 3-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Meydell et al., Hundley, III, Sandford, and Veal et al. teach similar centrifugal dryers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathryn S. O'Malley whose telephone number is (703)308-2844. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached on (703)308-1935. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KSO

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700